

**MINUTES
OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (HPAC)
OF
ARIZONA STATE PARKS
MEETING OF October 20, 2008
Boyce Thompson Arboretum State Park
37615 US Highway 60
Superior, Arizona**

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Thorne called the meeting to order at 10:05am. Ms. Shulman called the roll and noted that there was a quorum.

Committee Members Present: Winston Thorne, Chair
Tess Nesser
Joe Nucci
Bonnie Bariola
Tami Ryall (*arrived at 10:45*)
Vic Linoff

Committee Members Absent: Charles Ebner

Arizona State Parks Staff Present: Doris Pulsifer, Chief of Grants
Vivia Strang, Historic Preservation Grants
Consultant
Bill Collins, SHPO
Ruth Shulman, Advisory Group Coordinator

Guests: Mark Siegwarth, Director of Boyce Thompson
Southwest Arboretum

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

Members and Staff introduced themselves.

C. ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of the August 18, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Bariola moved to accept the minutes as presented. Ms. Nesser seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

2. Consider Request for Approval of Project End Date Extension for Historic Preservation Fund Project #640307 – the Center for Desert Archaeology – Coalescent Communities in Arizona

Ms. Strang said that the Center for Desert Archaeology had thought to be finished by this time however the National Register Nomination process has taken longer than anticipated. This process will cover all of the existing eligible Native American sites in Arizona, dating from 1200 to 1700. Staff recommends approving the extension.

Chair Thorne asked about the impact on the schedule and whether there might be additional costs. Ms. Strang said that the grant funds have been expended, and if there are additional costs, the Center will absorb those.

Ms. Bariola moved to approve extending the project end date from October 20, 2008 to October 20, 2009 for Project #640307 – the Center for Desert Archaeology – Coalescent Communities in Arizona and forwarding this recommendation to the Arizona State Parks Board for final action. Mr. Linoff seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

3. Review Historic Preservation Advisory Committee Applications and Make Recommendation to the Arizona State Parks Board to fill vacancies beginning January 1, 2009

Ms. Pulsifer noted that there are two openings on HPAC at this time. Two applications, from Mr. Nucci and Mr. Thorne, were received. These were the only applications incoming. Ms. Pulsifer noted that the bylaws allow for only three members from one county, which is currently exceeded. She reminded the members that the Assistant Attorney for General representing ASP had told HPAC that bylaws are guidelines. A motion was made at the time acknowledging the provisions of the bylaws, but to bypass the bylaws in order to retain the ability to form a quorum for HPAC meetings. Staff's recommendation at this time is to appoint Winston Thorne and Joe Nucci to an additional three-year term to HPAC. Ms. Bariola moved to recommend the reappointment of Winston Thorne and Joe Nucci to fill the two vacancies on HPAC and that they serve three-year terms beginning January 1, 2009, and that this recommendation be forwarded to the Arizona State Parks Board for final approval. Ms. Nesser seconded the motion.

Mr. Linoff noted that the reappointments would preserve institutional memory and that they are certainly worthy of reappointment. He is however concerned about the lack of applicants during the recruitment period. Ms. Shulman replied that low recruitment has occurred for each of the advisory groups with which she works. Potential applicants cited a number of reasons why they are unable or unwilling to commit the time to serving on an advisory group. Chair Thorne said that while those reasons are certainly true, there should be more advertisement of open positions on HPAC, particularly during workshops. Ms. Bariola noted that she feels that the time commitment, especially during these short-staffed times, is a factor. She also feels that it may be that the grant-writers do not feel eligible to apply for HPAC, or that serving on HPAC would hamper the grant submission process. Mr. Thorne noted that Mr. Linoff had previously mentioned that "new blood" in the organization is important, if only to test the established ways of decision making within HPAC. Ms. Nesser suggested a perpetual recruitment, with ongoing advertisements. Ms. Bariola also noted that HPAC members have a certain responsibility to also advertise openings to HPAC.

Mr. Nucci noted that because he continues to submit grants, he also serves to illustrate the precedent for HPAC members submitting grants, which should alleviate some of the issues along that line.

Chair Thorne called for the vote on the motion to reappoint. The motion carried with no further discussion. He asked for a recruitment item on the next agenda.

4. Appointment of Representative to Present a Report on Behalf HPAC to the ASP Board on November 21, 2008

Chair Thorne noted that the ASP Board had requested that an HPAC representative make a ten-minute presentation with Q&A at their November 21, 2008 ASP Board. Mr. Nucci said that, in the letter from Ms. Pulsifer extending the ASP Board's invitation, two broad "categories" were apparent. One is "Issues and Concerns" and the other is "Insights on Membership" which is unclear to him. He asked Ms. Pulsifer to clarify. Ms. Pulsifer said that the ASP Board was looking specifically for issues that affect HPAC, such as the recruitment issues. The ASP Board is also looking for highlights of issues discussed over the year, and what issues HPAC sees as forthcoming in 2009. Mr. Linoff said that he feels it important to discuss developing a policy for dealing with large-scale acquisitions that affect the grant fund budget. He feels that these decisions are currently made on an ad-hoc basis. Two examples would be the purchase of Spur Cross Ranch and more recently, the purchase of the Picket Post House. He noted that in a recent presentation to the ASP Board regarding the ASP set-aside from the grant funds, HPAC made a beginning of bringing the Board to an understanding that "scrambling" to make a big purchase may not be the most effective or efficient path.

Mr. Nucci suggested that any presentation contain the preamble that the Heritage Fund Historic Preservation grants remain the only bricks-and-mortar preservation money available in Arizona. From that start, HPAC could go on to discuss the hard work represented by having two grant cycles and why those two cycles are important. If HPAC returned to a single grant cycle, the entire program would be diminished and negatively affected. Mr. Nucci would like this information to be part of the "speaking points" in the presentation.

Chair Thorne asked if this request from the ASP Board was precipitated by a specific event, and if the ASP Board had done this in the past. Mr. Ream said that he had mentioned these presentations to the Board as a way for the advisory committees to speak to the Board outside of the business agenda at Board meetings. This way, the ASP Board would become familiar with their advisory committees, their work, and the members. This would also make the Board familiar with how the committees formulate their advice to the Board. Mr. Ream further elaborated on the importance of interaction between the ASP Board and its advisory committees. Chair Thorne then asked if the ASP Board gets a chance to read the HPAC meeting minutes in order to get an idea of the decision process within HPAC. Mr. Ream said he did not know.

Mr. Linoff said that, in creating the two grant cycles within a year, HPAC made several presentations to the ASP Board, which allowed both "sides" to contribute valuable ideas and information in order to make the best decision. He feels that the communication created a more informed relationship between HPAC and the ASP Board.

Mr. Siegwarth said that, in his opinion, State Parks is undergoing some changes. The current director is retiring; there continues to be funding issues, and he feels that the ASP Board's request for insight into membership they are asking for clarification into the capabilities of the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee, which will allow the ASP Board to fully utilize those capabilities.

Chair Thorne said that he would like to begin crafting the presentation. He suggested discussing the prior "emergency" fund, and why that is no longer part of the HPAC repertoire. He would also like to understand some of the future objectives of the ASP Board and how HPAC can align itself with those objectives. Ms. Nesser said that the

ASP Board presentation would be an opportune moment to make the Board aware of the grant review process and how that informs the HPAC recommendations.

Chair Thorne asked if Ms. Strang and the Staff had been able to consider some “speaking points”. He also asked if five of the ten minutes were for presentation, with the remaining five minutes for Q&A. Ms. Pulsifer said that the presentation would be ten minutes, and then an additional ten minutes for Q&A. Mr. Nucci suggested that a subject list for the presentation be made at this meeting.

HPAC members made a list of suggested topics for the presentation:

1. Membership and recruitment, including a handout list of current members with brief biographical sketch, the regional impact, how the members can interact with the ASP Board.
2. Why HPAC exists – their issues and concerns: includes the grants process and examples projects as well as the bricks-and-mortar preface mentioned above, as well as functioning in these difficult economic times. One concern would be to establish a policy for large-scale acquisitions. Chair Thorne discussed policy and planning in the context of the grant process. Mr. Nucci noted that the economic issue is a double-edged sword, with lessened development pressure, but fewer funds available for maintenance. He noted that Ms. Bariola had a list of completed projects that would make a good handout as well. Ms. Ryall noted that there has been a disconnect between what the Heritage Fund Historic Preservation was established to do, and why it’s important. Chair Thorne noted that this speaks to the intangible part of the grant application, as it applies to matching funds, and preparation/organization within the projects. Mr. Linoff also noted the problem of deferred maintenance on ASP’s historic properties, which also creates budget pressure. These expenditures should be outside of the grant process. Chair Thorne also noted that inflation in costs also affects the grants process. He would like to see a larger portion of the Heritage Funds be made available to Historic Preservation. Further discussion followed.

(Ms. Strang’s list on the board included the items above under the following subheads.)

Mr. Nucci noted that an important point to make is that the HP program leverages value through the matching funds, and also through the high level of necessary planning. Chair Thorne suggested that photos and testimonial letters (if possible) be added to the list of completed projects.

Ms. Nesser asked how many historic properties in Arizona are or may be in need of HP funds. Mr. Collins noted that there are currently approximately 700 properties on the National Register of Historic Places in Arizona. This does not include the individual houses in each historic district. As for future needs, a property becomes eligible when it turns 50 years old. There would be approximately 8,000-10,000 houses in Maricopa County alone. To expand across the state, there may be approximately 100,000 eligible properties. Ms. Strang noted that as of 2006, there were 579 grants made.

Mr. Linoff noted that the nature of HPAC’s work means that it all occurs outside of the ASP Parks system, with the exception of historic parks, and outside of a recreation focus. This requires special attention on the part of the ASP Board. Mr. Nucci noted that, with the low profile of HP activities, it would be important to

stress the wide constituency developed by HPAC through the years. This is also reflected in the community benefit requirement in the grant process.

Mr. Ream said, in response to a question from Chair Thorne, that he believes these presentations will become an annual event. If there is a specific issue that needs to be addressed any other time that is possible. However, annual presentations will improve dialogue and communication.

Mr. Ream also noted that the Heritage Fund is inadequate to be spread as it is. The Heritage Alliance is looking to expand the Heritage Fund. Further discussion on Heritage Funds followed.

Ms. Ryall suggested that the presentation include some "next steps" for what HPAC expects to accomplish, and what expectations they have of the Board.

Ms. Bariola moved to appoint Winston Thorne as the HPAC representative to make this presentation to the Arizona State Parks Board at their meeting of November 21, 2008. Chair Thorne said that he would like to have an additional presenter in Mr. Linoff. Ms. Bariola added that to the motion, which Ms. Nesser seconded. The motion carried with no further discussion.

Mr. Nucci said that, as a regularly scheduled annual presentation, it may be helpful to use the presentation as team-building with the ASP Board. He suggested a three part report consisting of history, current status of accomplishments and issues, and next steps/goals. Chair Thorne also noted a need for flexibility in the process as well as why HPAC exists. This was recently demonstrated in approving an application for an archaeological site, which challenged the definition of "bricks-and-mortar" for HPAC.

Mr. Linoff said that the "speaking points" and handouts should be circulated amongst the HPAC members. Discussion followed on the use of PowerPoint for the photos only, and having the draft ready for circulation by November 1, 2008. Because most of the handout information is already created, there would be time to complete a draft. Comments should be directed to Staff.

D. WORK SESSION

Ms. Pulsifer noted that the discussion of the grant process and manual should and could be finalized at the December HPAC meeting. She would like for this discussion to focus on the Strategic Plan. Mr. Nucci said that, as a matter of introduction, when the administrative compliance score was added, it became possible for an applicant to score 110 points. This was adjusted and the total possible score returned to 100 points. This means that, effectively, the qualitative rating score is based on 80 possible points. At this point, the quantitative section (administrative points, and the match) consists of 20 points. Eighty points for qualitative categories is insufficient, and there have been unintended consequences with the grant program. The ASP Board requirement for determining the high-priority projects has not been changed, and should not be. Mr. Nucci outlined three points: 1) the maximum 80 points is less than before, and is not enough; 2) the 20 points in two quantitative categories is too great portion of the 100 points available; and 3) it is necessary to readjust the total points to allow a minimum of 85 points available in qualitative sections, and that the current emphasis on Community Benefit and Planning be retained and reinforced by the adjustment.

Mr. Nucci asked Ms. Strang if she agreed with this analysis, at least enough to schedule further discussion on the next agenda. Ms. Strang said she did agree. Mr. Collins gave a brief history of the rating points distribution.

Ms. Bariola said that she did not feel there had, in the beginning, been any points for the matching funds. Mr. Collins said that when points were awarded for matching funds, other points were deducted elsewhere in the rating. Ms. Strang said that allowing ten points for the match is creating imbalance between those entities with money and those without. It seems to her that moneyed applicants are “purchasing” the extra ten points. Chair Thorne then pointed out that, as far as applicants with a match, being able to provide matching funds speaks to the financial viability of the project as a whole. Further discussion followed on which applicants, such as governmental entities, are able to provide a match in the first place. Ms. Ryall noted that, in the current economic situation, reducing the match requirement may not be prudent. Mr. Linoff said that it may be possible to consider the quantitative point separately, thereby allowing the qualitative points to be 100.

Ms. Strang said that she would supply information to HPAC to facilitate information-based decision-making on this subject. Further discussion on scoring followed. Mr. Nucci asked if other grant programs had both administrative compliance and matching fund points, and if all were trying to make an 80-point qualitative score. Ms. Pulsifer said they were. The strategic plan line is not identical across programs.

Ms. Pulsifer noted that she had provided a handout regarding the strategic plan line. This chart outlines the effect that would occur if the plan line changed by using the last grant cycle’s information. Mr. Nucci noted that he would like to see how the strategic plan line affects other programs. Chair Thorne noted that the strategic plan line also affects the carryover available for the second cycle, or even the following year. Ms. Strang noted that other programs, if funds are available, can fund projects below the strategic plan line, and that this option is also available to HPAC, though it was not exercised during the last grant cycle. Mr. Nucci suggested that, in a rush to exhaust funds and not leave a carryover, there may be a dual standard evolving which is unnecessary. Mr. Linoff reviewed the process by which HPAC developed the 2/3 – 1/3 division between first and second cycle funds. This has been reviewed and found to work well. He also noted that there was a time when very low-scoring applications were funded, and this led to some unfortunate consequences. Ms. Bariola noted that there is a very noticeable “break” in the line between applications that score well and those that do not. Ms. Pulsifer noted that in this last grant cycle, if funds had been available, the application that fell below the strategic plan line could have been funded. Further discussion followed.

Mr. Nucci wanted to understand how the scores are clustering and how that affects the actual projects.

Chair Thorne said that this discussion should be on the agenda for the next meeting.

E. REPORTS

1. Parks Board Actions on HPAC Items

Ms. Pulsifer said that the ASP Board had approved the six grant recommendations forwarded to them for a total of \$584,293, as well as returning to the HP grant program the set-aside of \$150,000 generally given to ASP. Both Chair Winston and Mr. Linoff spoke to the Board about the set-aside and were instrumental in having the funds returned. Ms. Nesser asked where ASP would be finding the funds to do the

work that would have been done with the set-aside. Ms. Strang said that the work was not planned until 2010, so there should be no affect.

2. Heritage Fund Report

Ms. Pulsifer said that the distribution had been received, and though the distributions were late in coming and the HF is currently behind, she noted that generally the HF is fully funded by April. The Heritage Fund is revising the way distributions are made, and this will affect how the HF report will be given. The next distribution may not be received until January 2009.

3. Grant Staff Update

Ms. Strang noted that the "big check" (Historic Preservation Heritage Fund sign) presentation in Florence went well. The newspaper report is being circulated.

4. SHPO Reports

Mr. Collins noted that Connie Gibson, staff archaeologist had submitted a resignation. Because of the hiring freeze, this position is not expected to be filled anytime soon. Another resignation is expected as well.

National Register Listings: The actual number of listing made recently is light. The new listings are: Hunt's Tomb in Phoenix , the Sedona Ranger Station, and several amendments to various historic districts in Tucson, plus a major amendment to the Feldman's Historic District in Tucson.

Mr. Collins also noted that the next Historic Preservation Conference will be held June 18-20, 2009 in Phoenix at the Hyatt Regency. Author Jay Heinrichs, whose book "Thank You for Arguing" became the theme of the conference (Arguing For Preservation) will speak, as will Gwendolyn Wright of the PBS series "History Detectives". Chair Thorne asked if a grants workshop could be held during the conference. Mr. Collins replied that there are several workshops scheduled during the conferences, and that Ms. Strang will be a speaker at the conference. The conference will also be a good time to advertise openings on HPAC. Mr. Linoff noted that nominating HPAC for the Governor's Preservation awards should still be under consideration. Ms. Strang noted that Paula Moloff will be making a nomination of the partnership between the City of Glendale and ASP for the Preserving America Presidential Awards.

F. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Mark Siegwarth, recently appointed Director of the Boyce Thompson Southwest Arboretum, welcomed HPAC to the Arboretum and encouraged members to visit the gardens, which are also historic. Many of the plants date from the 1920s when Col. Thompson built the gardens and greenhouses with the help of Aldo Leopold. Also of historic note is that the Boyce Thompson Arboretum, Inc. is the first 501c3 nonprofit corporation in Arizona.

Mr. Siegwarth went on to discuss some of the history of Col. Thompson and his reasons for establishing the gardens, including his visit to Russia post-revolution. He also noted that the Arboretum plans to rehabilitate the historic greenhouses, as well as the Smith building. The Arboretum is looking to focus on the history of the State Park, which will eventually include the Picket Post House.

Mr. Linoff asked if there was a connection planned between the Arboretum and the Picket Post House. Mr. Siegwarth noted that the Arboretum Board, to whom he reports, is looking to take some time prior to finalizing plans for the Picket Post House. At the moment his focus will be building both the volunteer base and fund raising base beyond what exists today. Mr. Ream offered to show HPAC the walking path between the Arboretum and Picket Post House.

**G. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF BOARD PROCEDURE,
REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS**

Recruitment strategies and the media; continue the work session; discuss the set-aside with Jay Ream; meeting locations for next year.

H. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

December 15, 2008 – Mr. Nucci will advise if the City Council Chambers in Tempe is available for this meeting.

I. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Thorne adjourned the meeting at 12:37pm.